



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,431	03/07/2002	Erling Stage	367.40412X00	4496

20457 7590 05/24/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

LE, DANH C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

8

DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/936,431

Applicant(s)

STAGE ET AL.

Examiner

DANH C LE

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 17-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wecker (US 6,311,058) in view of Smith (US 6,272,333).

As to claim 17, Wecker teaches a radio handset for browsing the internet (figure 6) comprising:

a browser application (218) which provides a user of the handset access to the internet via a first transceiver (22) which sends radio packets to and receives radio packets from an internet gateway;

a router (216) arranged to route content supplied by the internet gateway via the first transceiver to a registered application (16) and the content having an identifier which identifies the type of application suitable for receiving the content.

a user interface connected to the browser application having a display for displaying content (45) and a user input; and

an interface having a radio transceiver for coupling with an interface of an accessory device comprising a remote application, the interface being arranged to receive content routed to the remote application and to thereby increase the functionality of the handset.

Wecker fails to teach the remote application is automatically registered by the router in response to the coupling of the handset and accessory device and arranged to register applications by associating an application on registration with at least one identifier. Smith teaches the remote application is automatically registered by the router in response to the coupling of the handset and accessory device and arranged to register applications by associating an application on registration with at least one identifier (col.3, line 56-col.4, line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Smith into the system of Wecker in order to deliver different data types to different unit.

As to claim 18, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17, wherein transmission from and to the transceiver (22) is in accordance with the WAP protocol.

As to claim 19, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the first transceiver (22) and the radio transceiver (26) are separate.

As to claim 20, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the radio transceiver communicates with the accessory device using low power radio frequency signals (col.11, lines 41-54).

As to claim 21, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 20 wherein the radio transceiver transmits and receives signals according to the Bluetooth standard (col.3, lines 55-67).

As to claim 22, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the router and the browser application are integrated (col.8, line 50-col.9, line 63).

As to claim 23, Wecker teaches handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein a processor including a memory which executes the browser application (figure 2, 32).

As to claim 24, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the router comprises a look-up table associating application addresses with an identifier or identifiers (col.11, lines 18-28).

As to claim 25, Wecker teaches a handset as claimed in claim 24 wherein registration of an application comprises entry of the application's address and an associated identifier or identifiers in the routing table (col.11, lines 18-28).

As to claim 26, the combination of Wecker and Smith teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the identifier for the content comprises the content type (Smith, col.7, lines 7-16).

As to claim 27, the combination of Wecker and Smith teaches a handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the router de-register is registered applications by disassociating the application with an associated at least one identifier (Smith, col.3, line 26-col.4, line 11).

As to claim 28, the combination of Wecker and Smith teaches handset as claimed in claim 27 wherein de-registration occurs in response to removal of an

Art Unit: 2683

application from the handset and/or in response to the de-coupling of the handset and accessory device (Smith, col.3, line 26-col.4, line 11).

As to claim 29, the combination of Wecker and Smith teaches handset as claimed in claim 17 wherein the browser application is a registered application (Wecker, col.9, lines 40-63).

As to claim 30, the claim is a system claim of claim 1; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 1.

As to claim 31, Wecker teaches a radio handset for browsing the Internet (figure 6) comprising:

a browser (218) application which allows a user of the handset to access the internet via a first transceiver (22) means arranged to send radio packets to and receive radio packets from an Internet gateway;

routing (216) means arranged to route content supplied by the Internet gateway via the first transceiver means to a registered application (16), the content having an identifier for identifying the type of application suitable for receiving the content.

a user interface connected to the browser application having a display (45) for displaying content and user input means; and an interface having a radio transceiver for coupling with an interface of an accessory device comprising a remote application, the interface being arranged to receive content routed to the remote application and to thereby increase the functionality of the handset.

Wecker teaches the remote application is automatically registered by the routing means in response to the coupling of the handset and accessory device, arranged to

register applications by associating an application on registration with at least one identifier (col.3, line 56-col.4, line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Smith into the system of Wecker in order to deliver different data types to different unit.

As to claim 32, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 18; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 18.

As to claim 33, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 19; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 19.

As to claim 34, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 20; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 20.

As to claim 35, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 21; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 21.

As to claim 36, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 22; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 22.

As to claim 37, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 23; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 23.

As to claim 38, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 24; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 24.

As to claim 39, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 25; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 25.

As to claim 40, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 26; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 26.

As to claim 41, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 27; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 27.

As to claim 42, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 28; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 28.

As to claim 43, the limitation of the claim is the same limitation of claim 29; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 29.

As to claim 44, the claim is a system claim of claim 31; therefore, the claim is interpreted and rejected as set forth as claim 31.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. Smith (US 5,974,085) teaches the wireless modem and method therefore for routing data to an application or to storage.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANH C LE whose telephone number is 703-306-0542. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM TROST can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Danh C.Le



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600